

**To:** Robert Law[rlaw@demaximis.com]  
**Cc:** Willard Potter[otto@demaximis.com]; Mike Barbara  
(mab.environmental@gmail.com)[mab.environmental@gmail.com]; Basso, Ray[Basso.Ray@epa.gov]  
**From:** LaPoma, Jennifer  
**Sent:** Thur 5/26/2016 3:27:49 PM  
**Subject:** LPRSA RI Comment Follow Up -  
[Raritan Slag Table 4-20a.pdf](#)  
[Raritan Slag Table 4-4b.pdf](#)  
[Gowanus Table 4-8a.pdf](#)  
[Example RI Table.pdf](#)

Rob,

As discussed yesterday, the use of sediment quality guidelines (SQGs) as a sediment screening tool in the RI Report is consistent with the approach used in RI Reports at the other R2 sites including Gowanus and Raritan Slag. Attached are tables from the RI Reports from the aforementioned sites as well as one other example which compares data to multiple criteria.

Table 4-20a from Raritan Slag RI is an example of as associated screening table of detected results on a sample by sample basis

Table 4-8a from the Gowanus RI is an example of using a simple statistical table to present a summary of data screened against risk values.

The table with no site name is an example of a screening table where the data are compared to multiple screening values.

Here is the link to Appendix D from the lower 8.3 mile risk assessment which provided a table with all contaminants and max and min values and NJDEP's benchmarks for each contaminant were provided where available.

<http://passaic.sharepointspace.com/Public%20Documents/2014-02-20%20Appendix%20D%20Risk%20Assessment.pdf>

As we discussed yesterday for comparison to SQGs it would be acceptable to present data above RM 8.3.

For water quality it would be most appropriate to present data for the whole river.

If you have any questions please let me know.

Thanks,

Jennifer LaPoma